exaggerates his alienation. The father becomes unnaturally class-conscious, imposing "ridiculous and absurd" restrictions on his family. He suffers from "unnecessary fears concerning his children." While Clarke does not emphasize the connection, these would appear to have excited his "hysterical antipathy" to animals. William B. first expresses his "moral imbecility" by torturing poultry. In such suggestive ways the son's subsequent narrative of "moral imbecility" almost seems to be an extension, a criminal completion, of the father's story of immigration and exile in -- as Clarke puts it -- the "primitive society" of Canada.

William B.'s subsequent "career" becomes a grotesque parody of the father's, just a William himself grotesquely caricatures his father's gentlemanly ideal. After advancing to mutilating horses and assaulting siblings, he briefly finds a place for himself in the United States Cavalry. He deserts, and resumes his torture of animals and people alike, till he is committed to the Rockwood Criminal Asylum in February in 1870 and the penitentiary in 1877. Pardoned in 1878, immediately upon his release he mutilates another horse, is recaptured, and admitted to the Kingston Asylum.

The rest of William B.'s career is worse. On August 20, 1884, he escapes from a picnic on the Asylum grounds, assaults a 13 year old girl, but is arrested before he can rape her. Clarke uses the subsequent trial to illustrate the need for the law to take into account such phenomena as moral imbecility and criminal insanity. While it is impossible to convince the public that William B. is "irresponsible," it seems unwilling to find him simply guilty either. The result of this impasse is leniency, a six-month sentence after which William B. would be released once again into the community. Clarke cynically observes that "B. was delighted at the prospect and seems to have thoroughly appreciated the advantages to be gained from being a moral imbecile" (227).

From Clarke's testimony "moral imbecility" comes to involve, or at least to allow for, the capacity to create the "impression" of having "a mind equal, if not superior, to that of the average of his class in life" (220). Perhaps it also allows the doctor to account for strikingly immoral behaviour in someone like William B., who otherwise does appear to be responsible, or simply criminal. The operative word is "impression," as Clarke insists:

> after an extended acquaintance with B. you are convinced that he is in reality a man of a very low order of intellect, in fact,